IN THE HIGH COURT OF KERALA AT ERNAKULAM

PRESENT :

THE HONOURABLE MR. JUSTICE K.A.ABDUL GAFOOR
&
THE HONOURABLE MR. JUSTICE K.R.UDAYABHANU

TUESDAY, THE 12TH DECEMBER 2006 / 21ST AGRAHAYANA 1928

WA.No. 2001 of 2006(A)

AGAINST THE JUDGEMENT/ORDER IN WPC.8408/2006 Dated 09/08/2006

.....

APPELLANT: PETITIONER:

SUNNY PHILIPOSE, AGED 39,
S/O.T.S. PHILIPOSE, QTS.NO.303D,
RAILWAY COLONY, MADGAVU, GOA-4361.

BY ADV. SRI.V.RAJENDRAN (PERUMBAVOOR)
SRI.GEORGE VARGHESE KIZHAKKAMBALAM

RESPONDENTS:
---

1. THE KERALA PUBLIC SERVICE COMMISSION
REPRESENTED BY ITS SECRETARY, C/O.OFFICE OF
THE KERALA PUBLIC SERVICE COMMISSION,
THIRUVANANTHAPURAM.

2. THE CHAIRMAN, THE KERALA PUBLIC
SERVICE COMMISSION, THIRUVANANTHAPURAM.

BY ADV. SRI. P.C. SASIDHARAN, SC, P.S.C

THIS WRIT APPEAL HAVING COME UP FOR ADMISSION ON 12/12/2006,THE COURT ON THE SAME DAY DELIVERED THE FOLLOWING:

K.A. ABDUL GAFOOR & K.R. UDAYABHANU, JJ

W.A. NO. 2001 OF 2006

Dated this the 12th day of December 2006

JUDGMENT

Abdul Gafoor, J

The appellant/writ petitioner responded to notification issued by the Public Service Commission for appointment to the post of Assistant Motor Vehicles Inspector. The notification insisted that an applicant should have atleast one year experience in a Government approved automobile workshop. The appellant produced 3 certificates showing his experience. The Public Service Commission on scrutiny found that two among the certificates overlapped the same period. Therefore, his application was rejected, obviously, finding that the testimonials produced by the petitioner to prove his experience were not genuine. The selection process culminated in the publication of a rank list on 06.12.2005. When the petitioner did not find his name in the list, he enquired and found that his application was rejected. Thereupon he attempted to furnish Ext. P14 certificate

from the workshop which issued Ext.P3 certificate to cover up the discrepancy. Even if the contention of the petitioner that the date mentioned in Ext.P3 was because of typographical error and the correct period of experience certified in Ext.P3 is as mentioned in Ext.P14, that rectification was attempted far later than the publication of the rank list finalising the selection proceedings. Therefore, dismissal of the Original petition cannot be said to be unjustified to invite interference. The writ appeal is dismissed accordingly.

K.A. ABDUL GAFOOR, JUDGE

K.R. UDAYABHANU, JUDGE.

RV